

MYSORE

23413, 12-27-60,000 31 19 20.

Cmsd

REV (1950) Department.

R+ SERIES.

G.O. NO. 345

Dated 23-5-50

[Despatch Abstract.]

Rahman & P. Bellary
Aeris Acetate Petition for
inclusion in the list of Tehildars
Mentioned Respected.

Confidential

Revenue Department
subject

Rtanam Sri P.C. - (Bellary) - Acting Loans head
accountant - Collector's office - Petition for inclusion
in the list of Deputy Tahsildars Memorial - Submitted.

Ref.No.D.3096/50-3(C)

Station: Madras

dated the 19th April 1950.

From

Sri A.F.Mascarenhas, I.A.S.,
Secretary, Board of Revenue.

Sri V.N.Kudva, I.C.S., Commissioner of Commercial Taxes.
Sri W.R.S.Satthianathan, I.C.S., Commr. of Land Revenue.

Read the following:-

Memorial from Sri P.C.Ratnam dated nil.
Letter from Sri G.Rami Reddy, B.A., Collector of
Bellary, No.L.Dis.4512/50-A4 dated 25.3.1950:-

Ref:-

1. Petition of Sri P.C.Ratnam dated nil.
2. B.P.Rt.415 (Confdl) dated 2.3.1950.
3. G.O. Rt.No.34 Revenue dated 17.1.1950.

I enclose the petition of Sri P.C.Ratnam addressed to His Excellency the Governor of Madras for inclusion of name in the list of Deputy Tahsildars. He is a permanent lower division clerk in this department having put in 20 years of service. He is over-aged and therefore statutorily disqualified for inclusion of name in the Deputy Tahsildar's list. His name was not also proposed for inclusion in the Annual proposals of 1949 on account of age disqualification. He acted as Deputy Tahsildar for a short period under rule 3 A in the year 1946 as there were no better qualified people at that time.

He approached the Government on two occasions requesting for inclusion of his name in the list of Deputy Tahsildars but his request was not complied with on both the occasions (in G.O. Rt.No.962 Revenue dated 15.11.1948 and G.O. Rt. 34 Revenue dated 17.1.1950). His personal file has already been sent to the Government with this office C.No.1480/50(Confdl.)dated 1.3.50 in connection with the list of persons who acted as Deputy Tahsildars under rule 3 A and 9(a).

I have no remarks to offer.

REFERENCE:

Submitted to the Government.

x x x

for Secretary.

To the Secretary to Govt., Rev. Dept. With a petition.

48/11/7

/true copy/

To

His Excellency the Governor of Madras,

M a d r a s.

Through the proper channel.

May it please Your Excellency,

Sub:- Public services - M.R.S.S - Bellary Dt.
Inclusion in the list of Deputy Tahsildars-
Petition of Rathnam (Sri P.C.) - for
Mercy - submitted.

The humble petitioner prayerfully submits as follows:-

The humble petitioner submitted a petition to the Government on 30.6.'47 for age exemption and inclusion in the list of Deputy Tahsildars. The benign Government in their Order No.962 Revenue Department dated 15.11.1948 refused his request. Again on 14.10.'49 the petition was renewed for reconsideration of the refusal orders passed already. Of course providing more particulars this time. The Govt. again gave him an endorsement refusing reconsideration also in their Order G.O.Rt.No.34 Revenue Department dated 17.1.1950, in spite of the fact that the petitioner represented that his case was a pitiable one, in as much as the period of exemption prayed for was only a negligible period of about five months. Yet the benign Govt. did not come to his rescue, with the result the petitioner has been thrown in to a state of disappointed miserable life. As the petitioner has felt that he has lost all chances of approaching the Govt. and with a view to save himself from the deadly effects of a disappointed life, the humble petitioner has ventured to set upon the last and final course open to him viz., to approach the highest authority, Your Excellency, with a prayer with folded hands for mercy. The petitioner throws himself at the mercy of your Excellency praying that the powerful hand with the inborn magnanimity of a Maharajah will be raised to save a loyal servant who served the benign Govt. for the last more than 20 years with enthusiasm and zeal, from being drowned in the ocean of mental agony. The humble petitioner has approached the supreme authority who can change the situation from death to life with a stroke of his pen, with the full confidence that he would certainly be saved from this life long misery.

The facts of the humble petitioner's lamentable fate are as follows:-

During the course of his representation, the petitioner is forced to come out with facts, which lead to injustice done by officers. Their names also have to be mentioned to give clear picture of the tale. The petitioner respectfully submits that any such reference may not be taken as disrespect to or insinuation against the officers.

p.t.●...

whom he served all these years obediently and respectfully.

The humble petitioner entered service in 1928. He served all these years, honestly, sincerely and ~~faith~~ faithfully. During this period from 1928 to 1946 he had successful promotions from the lowest rank of a clerk to that of a Deputy Tahsildar. He was appointed as Deputy Tahsildar under Rule 3(a) of M.B.S.S. Rules in May 1946 as a temporary measure. He has been maintaining a clean default sheet all these years. He has also a good personal file to his credit. Of course some officers made ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ some unsubstantiated adverse remarks here and there and these were concealed till 1949 quite against the rules.

Against the petitioner has represented his version also and requested for expunging the adverse remarks so as to make his personal file quite clean. The petitioner is a member of the Christian community which has not only been insufficiently represented in these posts in this Dt. but also lost many chances due to it in previous years. The above particulars show that the petitioner has all the required qualifications for his inclusion in the list of a Dy. Tahsildar and in all respects his case deserves better consideration but it was not considered in a very trifling disqualification the details of which are furnished below. The petitioner is said to have been born on 17.10.1905. He qualified himself for Dy. Tahsildar's post at the examination held in Dec. 1945, the result of which was published in March 1946. The only disqualification referred to above, is that he qualified himself just 5 months after he passed 40th year which the age limit for inclusion in the list of Dy. Tahrs. under the existing rule. This rule however is not statutory and is being relaxed in very many cases but it has become statutory only in respect of the unfortunate petitioner. During 1949 also 3 persons were exempted from this age restriction one of them Sri J. Thimmappa (a Non-brahmin Hindu backward community) on the ground of military service rendered by him and two others who were in the same situation as the petitioner himself in all respects viz., Sri H. Venkoba Rao (Brahmin) and Sri. I. Krishna Murthy Naidu (Non Brahmin Hindu) are said to have been exempted. Though these communities had enough of representation, because they worked as Dy. Tahsildars in the temporary cadre, just as the petitioner himself, for a period of 2 years. Here the petitioner respectfully submits that the petitioner also would have had the same benefit if he had only been allowed to continue to act for such a period. He feels pained to submit that he was thrown out of this post unjustly and persistently at every stage for reasons best known to the then Collector and also to the petitioner. Yet Official etiquette and decency do not permit the petitioner to express them even at the cost of his rumination. The facts in brief are as follows:-

The petitioner qualified himself for the post of a Dy. Tahsildar during March 1946. He was appointed to that post during May 1946 along with 3

juniors. This first appointment within a short period of qualifying himself speak to the fact that the petitioner was found capable of managing the post. He joined this post on 30.5.1946. Irrespective of his seniority, the petitioner was reverted on 6.7.46 though his juniors were allowed to continue. He was again appointed on 19.7.46 and was continued till 2.8.46 and was again reverted in spite of the fact that 2 other juniors were allowed to continue. For the 3rd time he was appointed to this post on 27.8.46. During his stay till 2.11.46 some more persons were appointed but he himself was reverted on 2.11.46 though the 2 persons appointed with him originally and 2 others appointed subsequently were allowed to continue uninterrupted. For the 4th time he was re-appointed as a Dy. Tahsildar on 13.2.47 and was finally reverted on 30.6.47. During March '48 when two vacancies in the cadre of Dy. Tahsildars were filled in, 2 new persons viz., Sri Krishna Murthy Sastry and Sri Sreenivasa Charlu were appointed and the petitioner's seniority was altogether overlooked. He represented his grievances to the then Collr. Sri K.N. Anantharaman, I.C.S., in person and also through petition on 28.3.48. It did not give the petitioner any relief nor was an endorsement given to him. During the period of petitioner's stay as Dy. Tahsildar he was not punished for bad work such as to debar him from further appointment. No such order was ever communicated to him. Again in Sept. 1948 some 8 persons almost all his juniors were appointed as Dy. Tahsildars. Here also his claims were denied. Against his denial the petitioner submitted an appeal petition on 23.9.48 to the Board of Revenue. In spite of the appeal petition still pending, 5 more persons were appointed in Oct. 1948 and many in subsequent months and years. A reminder on the appeal petition was also submitted on 13.1.49. The Board of Rev. passed orders in its Ref.No.D 10825/48 - (c). dated 16.2.49 (Confdl.) that it does not see any reason to comply with his request. These orders were passed while Sri K.N. Anantharaman I.C.S., was the Secretary to the Board of Revenue and it was against his injustice as Collr. that appeal was filed. This petition was disposed of in a summary way as if it was a petition for inclusion in the list of Deputy Tahsildars. A kind perusal of the purport with reference to his petition dated 23.9.48 and the orders issued in the matter will justify the version of the petitioner. The appeal petition was necessarily intended for interference by the Board of Revenue as otherwise there would have been no point in allowing presentation of appeals to the higher authorities. Yet the petitioner's appeal against injustice was disposed of summarily in such a light hearted manner. The petitioner did not pursue the matter further, as he thought that it would not help him anyway so long as Sri. K.N. Anantharaman I.C.S., was the Secretary to the Bd. of Rev. Under such unjust circumstances the petitioner submits that he could not continue in these posts for a period of two

years and thus he is deprived of claiming exemption from age restrictions as in the case of 2 persons referred to above. But for the injustice done by the Collector for none of the expressed wrong deeds or defects in the petitioner he would have certainly continued in the posts of Dy. Tahsildar for a period of more than two years by the time the two persons referred to above were included in the list of Dy. Tahsildars during 1949. He submits many of his juniors were allowed to continue till the middle of Feb. 1950. The last of them was Sri Krishna Murthy Sastry referred to above already. Therefore the petitioner submits that for the fault committed by the Collr. the unfortunate petitioner has been ruined for none of his faults. The benign Govt. and the Bd. of Rev. refused to understand the pitiable plight of a persecuted subordinate and failed to give a correct judgment on the merits of the case, for which purpose alone the petitioner approached the higher authorities. The petitioner is therefore forced to approach the highest authority to get himself saved from the effects of injustice done to him by his superiors.

It may be that the exemption granted to the 3 persons referred to earlier was based on the Collr. recommendation. If it is so, it is highly improbable that a Collr. who did the worse injustice to the petitioner on account of his representation of existing facts which most probably upset him would have left any favourable remark in the petitioner's case. In all probability he might have added only an unfavourable remark. The petition addressed to the Govt. on 30.6.47 was actually submitted by the Collr. on 20.7.47 ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ i.e., after a delay of more than one year and that too on submission of reminders by the petitioner on 18.2.1948, and 13.6.48. A kind perusal of B.P. Routine No. 7794 confd. dated 3.11.48 will reveal this fact. By the time this petition was submitted, by the Collr. to the Govt. the petitioner had already made the said representation to the Collr. Again when the petitioner reviewed his petition during Oct. 1949 there was a new Collr. (Sri N.V. Suguvanam B.A.). This Collr. was also misguided by persons on whom he depended for certain official information. The petitioner submits that he was misguided to the extent that he sarcastically said in the very face of the Officer Special Land Acquisition Dy. Collr. (Famine Roads), Bellary who recommended his the petitioner's case for exemption and inclusion in the list of Dy. Tahsildars and of the petition that his (Officers) recommendations were after all parting gifts on the eve of his officer's transfer. Most probably this Collr. (Sri N.V. Suguvanam) might have said the same thing also or something akin to it etc., in his report on the petitioner's case. Therefore it can be seen that even a new Collector whom the petitioner never met formed a wrong opinion about the petitioner entirely believing interested persons. He seems to have thrown away a genuine report of an officer under whom the petitioner worked for one year, in a special establishment

at the cost of his health. The previous Collector had harped on some unfounded adverse remarks to do his bit of injustice and the new Collr. was misguided and formed his own view in spite of immediate superior officer's remarks. AT this rate, the petitioner fears neither of the Collr. might have recommended his case for exemption and so the petitioner is made to suffer. The higher authorities the benigh Govt. and the Ed. of Revenue at least should

Revenue Dept.

Read:-

G.O.Ms.No.962 Rev. dt.15.11.49

~~From~~ G.O.Ms.No. 34 Rev. dated 17.1.50.

From Sri P.C.Ratnam, memorial to H.E. the
Governor dated nil.

, From the Board of Revenue Ref.D.3096/50-3 dt.19.4.50.

...

G.O. Rt. no.345 dated 23.5.1950.

H.E. the Governor declines to interfere on
behalf of the memorialist. The memorial is rejected.

x x x
22.5.50.

To the Memorialist
thro the Bd. of Rev.
Copy to the Board of Revenue.
(with F.F.)

.....

True copy/

tn./27.6. *ls*
"11"